

Tales and tails of BSDEs

Juha Ylinen*

January 7, 2015

Abstract

We deduce conditional L_p -estimates for the variation of a solution of a BSDE. Both quadratic and subquadratic types of BSDEs are considered, and using the theory of weighted BMO we deduce tail estimates for the solution on subintervals of $[0, T]$. Some new results for the decoupling method introduced in [15] are obtained and used.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	4
3	Weighted BMO-estimates for BSDEs	8
3.1	Decoupled FBSDE	8
3.2	BSDE	10
4	A couple of coupling results	14
4.1	Setting	14
4.2	Decoupling operators	15
4.3	Basic properties	16
4.4	Conditional results	19
5	Proofs of main results	22
5.1	Proof of Theorem 3.1	23
5.2	Proof of Theorem 3.10	25
5.3	Proof of Theorem 3.11	31

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, Finland. E-mail: juha.ylinen@jyu.fi

1 Introduction

In this paper we study BSDEs of type

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (1)$$

where $T > 0$ is a fixed time horizon and $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion. The generator f can be random, is assumed to be Lipschitz in the y -variable, but may grow quadratically in the z -variable.

BSDEs were first introduced in [2], and the amount of research in this area increased significantly after [24] where it was shown that a BSDE with data in L_2 and a uniformly Lipschitz generator has a unique solution. In [5] this was extended to the case where the data is in L_p , with $1 < p < \infty$. More recently, the theory of BSDEs with a generator that grows quadratically in the z -variable has been developed, see for example [20], [17], [22], [6], [10]. The original motivation of studying BSDEs came from stochastic optimal control theory. Besides this, BSDEs have applications for example in stochastic differential games, in stochastic finance in connection to option pricing and utility maximization, and they are also connected to a class of partial differential equations, as was already shown in [25].

When trying to simulate a solution of a BSDE, the system is discretized for the computer. For example in [4] a backward Euler scheme that is piecewise-constant between points of a finite time-grid $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T$ is considered, and the study is based on objects like

$$Z_r^\pi := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{t_k}} \left[\frac{1}{t_{k+1} - t_k} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} Z_s ds \right] 1_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}(r)$$

for $r \in [0, T]$. It is of interest to know how far the approximation is from the exact solution, or in other words, how large the simulation error is. In [4] it is shown that the simulation error is upper bounded by the variation of the exact solution.

This leads us to study the variation of the exact solution. The present article can be seen as a continuation of [15], where the L_p -variation of the solution is considered. We use here conditional techniques to obtain by a weighted

John-Nirenberg type theorem better tail estimates than what would be obtained from an L_p -estimate. This is in particular a natural approach in Lipschitz settings, where the local estimates tend to be similar to the global ones (see Section 3.1). More generally, we will show that on any subinterval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ where the pair (ξ, f) satisfies a variational estimate (see Assumption 3.8), the tail probability $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{r \in [s, t]} |Y_r - Y_s| \geq \lambda)$ has an additive upper bound consisting of an exponential term and the tail-probability of a weight process. This will be a consequence of $(Y_r)_{r \in [s, t]}$ belonging to a *weighted BMO-space*, and the weight process is given explicitly in terms of integrability and variational properties of the pair (ξ, f) .

To say that a continuous martingale $M = (M_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of bounded mean oscillation, or $M \in \text{BMO}$, means in our setting that there exists $C > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma} |M_T - M_\sigma|^p \leq C$ for all stopping times $\sigma \in [0, T]$ and all (equivalently, for some) $0 < p < \infty$ (here one is referred to the excellent lecture notes [19]). In [14] this was generalized to weighted BMO by replacing the constant C by an adapted weight process. In more detail, we assume that $(A_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ is càdlàg and adapted, $(\Phi_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ is càdlàg, adapted and positive, and let $0 < p < \infty$. Then $A \in \text{BMO}_p^\Phi$ if

$$\|A\|_{\text{BMO}_p^\Phi} := \sup_{\sigma} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|A_T - A_{\sigma-}|^p}{\Phi_\sigma^p} \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma \right] \right\|_{L_\infty}^{1/p} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all stopping times $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow [0, T]$.

The assumptions of our main results, Theorems 3.10 and 3.11, are aplenty. This is why before going through all of them, we introduce a class of decoupled Lipschitz FBSDEs, for which these assumptions follow from standard conditions. The weight process in this case can be given in terms of the forward process, and is shown to be sharp.

Assumptions (C6) and (C7) in Assumption 3.8 below have not, as far as the author knows, been studied before. The idea is that we impose a weighted BMO-condition on the data (ξ, f) on some subinterval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$. Here one is tempted to study $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t} \xi - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \xi|^p$ for $u \in [s, t]$, but instead we will use $\mathcal{G}_u^t$ for the sigma-algebra that carries information from both $[0, u]$ and $[t, T]$, and study the quantity $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}_u^t} \xi|^p$ for $u \in [s, t]$. By Jensen's inequality this is larger than or equal to the aforementioned object. The difference between these two objects is, that the latter additionally measures how much ξ changes on the interval $[t, T]$ if it is perturbed on the interval $[u, t]$.

At first glance it is not clear how to find an upper bound of $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}_u^t} \xi|^p$. However, using a special decoupling technique, this task becomes feasible. In

Section 4 we will introduce the idea of our coupling and recall some needed results proven in [15]. We will also give some new conditional results that are necessary for proving Theorem 3.10 below.

2 Preliminaries

We fix a finite time horizon $T > 0$ and work on the stochastic basis

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$$

satisfying usual assumptions. In particular $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ is the augmented filtration of a d -dimensional Brownian motion W , $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$, and we assume that all paths of W are continuous. If not specified in a different way, we use the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ in statements and definitions. Moreover, the following notation will be used:

Notation 2.1. *The Lebesgue-measure on $[0, T]$ is denoted by λ , and*

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega_0, \Sigma_0, \mathbb{P}_0) &:= (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}), \\ (\Omega_T, \Sigma_T, \mathbb{P}_T) &:= \left([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{F}, \frac{\lambda}{T} \otimes \mathbb{P} \right). \end{aligned}$$

- Given a σ -algebra $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and $X \in L_1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, we denote the conditional expectation of X given $\mathcal{G}$ by $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}X := \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}]$.
- For $a, b, c > 0$ we let

$$\begin{aligned} a \leq_c b &\Leftrightarrow a \leq cb, \\ a \sim_c b &\Leftrightarrow \frac{b}{c} \leq a \leq bc. \end{aligned}$$

- For any $B \in \mathcal{F}$ of positive measure and any $A \in \mathcal{F}$ we let

$$\mathbb{P}_B(A) := \frac{\mathbb{P}(B \cap A)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}.$$

- For $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ we let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_s^t &:= \sigma(W_r, r \leq s) \vee \sigma(W_r - W_t, t < r \leq T), \\ \mathcal{H}_s^t &:= \mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{G}_s^t. \end{aligned}$$

- The (predictable) σ -algebra on Ω_T generated by $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted left-continuous processes is denoted by $\mathcal{P}$.

Inequalities concerning random variables, for example $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}X \leq Y$, hold in general only almost surely. If it is obvious what measure is used, we will just write $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}X \leq Y$.

Some of our stochastic processes will depend continuously on an additional parameter space. In our results concerning BSDEs this will be a Euclidean space, but some of our other results also hold when the parameter space has a more general topological structure. Specifically, we fix $\mathbb{X} \neq \emptyset$ to be a complete metric space that is locally σ -compact, i.e. there exist compact subsets $\emptyset \neq K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \dots$, such that $\overline{\mathring{K}_n} = K_n$ and $\mathbb{X} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathring{K}_n$. In particular $\mathbb{X}$ is separable, and we will use $\mathbb{A}$ for a dense countable subset. It is clear that $\mathbb{A}_n := \mathbb{A} \cap K_n$ is dense in K_n for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 2.2. For $S \in \{0, T\}$ we use

$$L_0(\Omega_S, \Sigma_S, \mathbb{P}_S; C(\mathbb{X}))$$

to denote the equivalence-classes¹ of $f : \Omega_S \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy:

1. $\eta \mapsto f(\eta, y)$ is Σ_S -measurable for all $y \in \mathbb{X}$,
2. $y \mapsto f(\eta, y)$ is continuous for all $\eta \in \Omega_S$.

Definition 2.3. Let $M = (M_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be a (continuous) martingale, and $p \in [1, \infty]$. If

$$\|M\|_{H_p} = \|\langle M \rangle_T^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_p} < \infty,$$

where $(\langle M \rangle_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the quadratic variation process of M , we say $M \in H_p$.

In our investigation we will need some facts concerning bounded mean oscillation, which we abbreviate by BMO from now on.

Definition 2.4. Let $M = (M_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be a (continuous) martingale with $M_0 \equiv 0$. If

$$\|M\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 := \sup_{\tau} \|\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{\tau}} |M_T - M_{\tau}|^2\|_{\infty} = \sup_{\tau} \|\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{\tau}} \langle M \rangle_T - \langle M \rangle_{\tau}\|_{\infty} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all stopping times, we say $M \in \text{BMO}$.

¹We identify f and g if $f(\eta, \cdot) = g(\eta, \cdot)$ for $\mathbb{P}_S$ -a.e. $\eta \in \Omega_S$.

The remaining results of this section are considered on a stochastic basis

$$(\Omega^*, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P}^*, (\mathcal{H}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$$

that satisfies usual assumptions, and such that $\mathbb{H} := (\mathcal{H}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ is the augmented filtration of an n -dimensional Brownian motion $B = (B_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$, and all paths of B are continuous. This basis can be the one fixed in the beginning, but we need some of the following results on a different probability space as well.

Definition 2.5. Let $M = (M_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be an $\mathbb{H}$ -martingale with $M_0 \equiv 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(M) = (\mathcal{E}(M)_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := (e^{M_t - \frac{1}{2}\langle M \rangle_t})_{t \in [0, T]}$$

is an $\mathbb{H}$ -martingale as well, and let $\beta \in (1, \infty)$. If

$$\mathcal{RH}_\beta^\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}(M))^\beta := \sup_\tau \left\| \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_\tau} \left| \frac{\mathcal{E}(M)_T}{\mathcal{E}(M)_\tau} \right|^\beta \right\|_\infty < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all stopping times, we say² $\mathcal{E}(M) \in \mathcal{RH}_\beta^\mathbb{H}$.

Next we define BMO for processes, and introduce *sliceable numbers*.

Definition 2.6. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and assume that $(c_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ is $\mathbb{H}$ -predictable, m -dimensional and such that

$$\|c\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})} := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\int_t^T |c_s|^2 ds \middle| \mathcal{H}_t \right) \right\|_{L_\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Then we say $c \in \text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})$. This is quantified using for any $N \geq 1$

$$\text{sl}_N^\mathbb{H}(c) := \inf \varepsilon,$$

where the infimum is taken over all $\varepsilon > 0$ such that there are stopping times $0 = \tau_0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_N = T$ with

$$\sup_{k=1, \dots, N} \|\chi_{(\tau_{k-1}, \tau_k]} c\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, we let $\text{sl}_\infty^\mathbb{H}(c) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{sl}_N^\mathbb{H}(c)$.

Some properties that we need later are collected in:

² $\mathcal{RH}$ stands for Reverse Hölder.

Lemma 2.7 ([15, Lemma 5.4]).

Assume that $c, c_1, c_2 \in \text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})$. Then one has the following:

- (i) $\text{sl}_1^{\mathbb{H}}(c) = \|c\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})}$.
- (ii) $\text{sl}_1^{\mathbb{H}}(c) \geq \text{sl}_2^{\mathbb{H}}(c) \geq \dots \geq 0$.
- (iii) $\text{sl}_{N_1+N_2-1}^{\mathbb{H}}(c_1 + c_2) \leq \text{sl}_{N_1}^{\mathbb{H}}(c_1) + \text{sl}_{N_2}^{\mathbb{H}}(c_2)$.

For our main application of sliceable numbers we introduce the function

$$\Phi : (1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty), \quad \Phi(q) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{q^2} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{2q-2}\right)\right)^{1/2} - 1,$$

so that Φ is continuous and decreasing, with $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\beta) = 0$ and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 1} \Phi(\beta) = \infty$. Furthermore, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi & : \left\{ (\gamma, p) \in [0, \infty) \times (1, \infty) : 0 \leq \gamma < \Phi(p) < \infty \right\} \rightarrow [0, \infty), \\ \Psi(\gamma, p) & := \left(\frac{2}{1 - \frac{2p-2}{2p-1} e^{p^2[\gamma^2+2\gamma]}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.8 ([15, Theorem 5.8]).

Assume that $c \in \text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})$ is n -dimensional and that $\text{sl}_N^{\mathbb{H}}(c) < \Phi(p)$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, putting $(M_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := (\int_0^t c_r dB_r)_{t \in [0, T]}$, we have

$$\mathcal{RH}_p^{\mathbb{H}}(\mathcal{E}(M)) \leq [\Psi(\text{sl}_N^{\mathbb{H}}(c), p)]^N.$$

In particular, if M is sliceable, i.e. $\text{sl}_{\infty}^{\mathbb{H}}(c) = 0$, then $\mathcal{E}(M) \in \bigcap_{p \in (1, \infty)} \mathcal{RH}_p^{\mathbb{H}}$.

We end the preliminary section with an extension of Fefferman's inequality, and the following conditional version. Note that here both X and Y may be multidimensional.

Proposition 2.9. Assume that $X \in \text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})$ and that $Y = (Y_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ is $\mathbb{H}$ -predictable and such that

$$\|Y\|_{H_p(S_2, \mathbb{H})}^p := \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |Y_r|^2 dr \right)^{p/2} < \infty$$

for some $p \in [1, \infty)$. Then

$$\left\| \int_0^T |X_r| |Y_r| dr \right\|_{L_p} \leq \sqrt{2p} \|Y\|_{H_p(S_2, \mathbb{H})} \|X\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{H})}.$$

Proof. We will exploit the martingale-setting by considering the first component $B_1 = (B_{r,1})_{r \in [0,T]}$ of the Brownian motion B , thus receiving a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion, and letting

$$\begin{aligned} N_t &:= \int_0^t |Y_r| dB_{r,1}, \\ M_t &:= \int_0^t |X_r| dB_{r,1}, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Then the claim follows directly from [11, Lemma 1.6]. $\square$

Corollary 2.10. *With the same assumptions as in Proposition 2.9, we have for $c_p = (\sqrt{2}p)^p$, and for all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ that*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_s} \left(\int_s^t |X_r| |Y_r| dr \right)^p \leq c_p \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_s} \left(\int_s^t |Y_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \sup_{r \in [s,t]} \left\| \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_r} \int_r^t |X_u|^2 du \right\|_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

3 Weighted BMO-estimates for BSDEs

In this section we first present a special case of our results, followed by the assumptions and main results in their most general form. Since a special technique is used to prove these results, we proceed by introducing the technique (Section 4) before proving the main results (Section 5).

3.1 Decoupled FBSDE

Consider for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the decoupled FBSDE

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= x + \int_0^t b(r, X_r) dr + \int_0^t \sigma(r, X_r) dW_r, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ Y_t &= g(X_T) + \int_t^T h(r, X_r, Y_r, Z_r) dr - \int_t^T Z_r dW_r, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We assume that $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $h : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous, and furthermore,

$(A_{b,\sigma})$ There exist $L_{b,\sigma}, K_\sigma > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} |b(t, x) - b(t, y)| + |\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y)| &\leq L_{b,\sigma} |x - y|, \\ |\sigma(t, x)| &\leq K_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

(A_g) There exists $L_g > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ one has

$$|g(x) - g(y)| \leq L_g |x - y|.$$

(A_h) There exists $L_h > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $x_i, z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$, one has

$$|h(t, x_1, y_1, z_1) - h(t, x_2, y_2, z_2)| \leq L_h(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2| + |z_1 - z_2|).$$

In particular we then have for some $L_h, K_h, K_b > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |h(t, x, y, z)| &\leq K_h + L_h(|x| + |y| + |z|), \\ |b(t, x)| &\leq K_b(1 + |x|), \end{aligned}$$

for all $(t, x, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Also, with these assumptions there exists a unique solution (Y, Z) to FBSDE (2) (see e.g. [5, Theorem 4.2]).

Our first result, a weighted BMO-estimate, is a consequence of Theorem 3.10. The main application is our second result, a general tail estimate.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume $(A_{b,\sigma})$, (A_h) , and (A_g) , and let $p \geq 2$. Then there exists $c_{(3.1)} > 0$, depending at most on $(T, d, p, L_h, L_g, L_{b,\sigma}, K_b, K_\sigma, K_h)$, such that for all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and all stopping times $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow [s, t]$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{|Y_t - Y_\tau|^p}{1 + |X_\tau|^p(t - \tau)^{p/2}} \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau \right) \leq c_{(3.1)}^p (t - \tau)^{p/2}.$$

Proof. See Section 5.1 below. □

Theorem 3.2. *Assume $(A_{b,\sigma})$, (A_h) , and (A_g) . Then there exists $c > 0$ such that for any $p \geq 2$, $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and any stopping time $\tau \in [s, t]$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\tau, t]} \frac{|Y_u - Y_\tau|}{c_{(3.1)} \sqrt{t - s}} > \lambda + c\mu\nu \right) &\leq e^{1-\mu} \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\tau, t]} \frac{|Y_u - Y_\tau|}{c_{(3.1)} \sqrt{t - s}} > \lambda \right) \\ &\quad + c \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\tau, t]} |X_u|^p (t - u)^{\frac{p}{2}} > \nu^p - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda, \mu, \nu > 0$, and all $B \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$ of positive measure.

Proof. See Section 5.3 below. □

One might ask if it is necessary to use the theory of *weighted* BMO; wouldn't traditional BMO suffice? As it turns out, the weight process of Theorem 3.1 is sharp:

Example 3.3. Let $d = 1, b \equiv 0, \sigma \equiv 1, h(t, x, y, z) = x$, and $g(x) = x$, and let Y be the solution of BSDE (2). Then for all $p \geq 2$, all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and all stopping times $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow [s, t]$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|Y_t - Y_\tau|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \geq (t - \tau)^{p/2} (1 + |X_\tau|^p (t - \tau)^{p/2}).$$

This holds, since for all $r \in [0, T]$ we have

$$Y_r = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_r} \left[W_T + \int_r^T W_u du \right] = W_r(1 + T - r),$$

so that for any stopping time $\tau \in [s, t]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} |Y_t - Y_\tau|^2 &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} |W_t(1 + T - t) - W_\tau(1 + T - \tau)|^2 \\ &= (t - \tau)(1 + T - t)^2 + |W_\tau|^2(t - \tau)^2 \\ &\geq (t - \tau)(1 + |W_\tau|^2(t - \tau)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{p}{2} \geq 1$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} |Y_t - Y_\tau|^p &\geq \left[\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} |Y_t - Y_\tau|^2 \right]^{p/2} \\ &\geq \left[(t - \tau)(1 + |W_\tau|^2(t - \tau)) \right]^{p/2} \\ &\geq (t - \tau)^{p/2} (1 + |W_\tau|^p(t - \tau)^{p/2}). \end{aligned}$$

3.2 BSDE

Now we consider a BSDE of type

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3)$$

where ξ is $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable, and $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{P}_T; C(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))^3$. Our strategy is to impose conditions on the gradient process Z in order to get an L_p -solution. Namely, we assume that there exists a solution to BSDE (3) satisfying for some $p \in [2, \infty)$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$:

(C1) The process Y is $(\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ -adapted and path-wise continuous, and the process Z is $(\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ -predictable.

(C2) There are $L_y, L_z \geq 0$ such that for all $(t, \omega, y_0, y_1, z_0, z_1)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t, \omega, y_0, z_0) - f(t, \omega, y_1, z_1)| \\ \leq L_y |y_0 - y_1| + L_z [1 + |z_0| + |z_1|]^\theta |z_0 - z_1|. \end{aligned}$$

³i.e. $\eta \mapsto f(\eta, x)$ is $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

$$(C3) \quad \int_0^T |f(s, 0, 0)| ds \in \mathcal{L}_p.$$

$$(C4) \quad \left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{L}_p.$$

$$(C4') \quad \int_0^T |Z_s|^{1+\theta} ds \in \mathcal{L}_p.$$

Assumption (C1) is here to emphasize the measurabilities; later we use it also with a different filtration. Assumptions (C2) and (C3) are conditions on the data of the BSDE, implicit conditions on the gradient process are (C4) and (C4').

Lemma 3.4 ([15, Lemma 6.2]). *Assume that (C1)-(C4) and (C4') hold for some $p \in [2, \infty)$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\int_0^T |f(s, Y_s, Z_s)| ds + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t| \in \mathcal{L}_p.$$

Another implicit condition is the following "fractional BMO-assumption":

(C5) We assume that

$$\| |Z|^\theta \|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{F})} = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\int_t^T |Z_s|^{2\theta} ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right) \right\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty,$$

and fix a non-increasing sequence $s = (s_N)_{N \geq 1} \subseteq [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\text{sl}_N^{\mathbb{F}}(|Z|^\theta) \leq s_N,$$

and put $s_\infty := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N$.

First we show that using (C5) we may drop (C4'):

Lemma 3.5. *We have the following relations for all $p \in [2, \infty)$:*

- (i) *If $\theta = 0$, then (C5) holds, and (C4) $\Rightarrow$ (C4').*
- (ii) *If $\theta = 1$, then (C5) $\Rightarrow$ (C4') $\Rightarrow$ (C4).*
- (iii) *If $\theta \in (0, 1)$, then (C4) $\stackrel{(C5)}{\Rightarrow}$ (C4').*

Proof. (i) is obvious and (ii) follows immediately from John-Nirenberg inequality [19, Theorem 2.1]. Proposition 2.9 applied to $X = |Z|^\theta$ and $Y = |Z|$ implies (iii). $\square$

Later we will use assumption (C5) together with reverse Hölder inequalities to handle a quadratic or subquadratic drift term in Theorem 3.10. The case $s_\infty = 0$ plays a special role, as then Theorem 2.8 implies that a certain martingale satisfies the reverse Hölder inequalities for all indices $q \in (1, \infty)$. If $s_\infty > 0$, we will only have the reverse Hölder inequalities for $q \in (1, \infty)$ that are small enough, and this is why we need to assume more integrability than in the case $s_\infty = 0$ (this is made precise in Assumption (C8) below). It holds $s_\infty = 0$ at least if $\theta = 0$, or if there exists an $\eta \in (\theta, 1]$ such that $|Z|^\eta \in \text{BMO}(S_2)$ (see [15, Remark 6.5]).

Convention 3.6. *If $(f, Y, Z, (\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$ satisfy (C1)-(C5) for $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and $p \in [2, \infty)$ and there is no risk of confusion, we say that (C1)-(C5) are satisfied for $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and $p \in [2, \infty)$.*

Example 3.7.

- (i) *Assume that f satisfies (C2) and (C3) with $\theta = 0$ and $p > 1$, and that $\xi \in L_p$. Then there exists a unique solution (Y, Z) of (3), and (C1)-(C5) are satisfied with $\theta = 0$. This follows for example from [5, Theorem 4.2]. Note that since $\theta = 0$, we have $s_\infty = 0$.*
- (ii) *Assume that f satisfies (C2) and (C3) with $\theta = 1$ and $p = \infty$, and that $\xi \in L_\infty$. Then there exists a unique solution (Y, Z) of (3), and (C1)-(C5) are satisfied with $\theta = 1$ and all $p \in [2, \infty)$. This follows for example from [22, Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 3.1].*

Finally we have the main assumption of this paper. We assume that ξ and f satisfy a certain weighted BMO-condition on a subinterval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$. This is used in the following way: if the assumption holds on an interval $[s, t]$, then *on this interval* we will have that the solution of our BSDE belongs to a weighted BMO-space, giving us a tail estimate.

Assumption 3.8. *There are $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ such that there exist càdlàg supermartingales $(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi)_{u \in [s,t]}$ and $(w_{p,s,u,t}^f)_{u \in [s,t]}$, which satisfy for any $u \in [s, t]$,*

$$(C6) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}_u^t} \xi|^p \leq w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi,$$

$$(C7) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{y,z} |f(r, y, z) - (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_u^t} f)(r, y, z)| dr \right)^p \leq w_{p,s,u,t}^f,$$

where $(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_u^t} f) : \Omega_T \rightarrow C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ is the⁴ $\mathcal{H}_u^t$ -measurable process with

$$\mathbb{P}_T \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_u^t} (f(x)) = (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{H}_u^t} f)(x) \right) = 1 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

⁴Existence and uniqueness of such process is proven in Proposition 6.3.

For more insight into this assumption one should read its reformulation, Assumption 5.3, and the preceding Section 4. At this point it is perhaps helpful to note that the solution of FBSDE (2) satisfies this assumption with very simple processes w_p^f and w_p^ξ . The proof is again postponed to Section 5.

Lemma 3.9. *Assume $(A_{b,\sigma}), (A_h)$ and (A_g) . Then assumptions (C1)-(C7) hold true for $\theta = 0$, all $p \in [2, \infty)$, and all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$. Moreover, there exists $c_{(3.9)} > 0$ depending at most on $(T, d, p, L_g, L_h, L_{b,\sigma}, K_\sigma)$ such that we may choose*

$$w_{p,s,u,t}^f = w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi = c_{(3.9)}^p (t - u)^{p/2}$$

for all $0 \leq s \leq u \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. See Section 5.1 below □

Here is the aforementioned restriction imposed by (C5):

(C8) If the number s_∞ in assumption (C5) satisfies $s_\infty > 0$, then in the assumptions (C3),(C4),(C6) and (C7), the constant $p \in [2, \infty)$ satisfies additionally

$$p > \frac{\Phi^{-1}(2\sqrt{2}L_z s_\infty)}{\Phi^{-1}(2\sqrt{2}L_z s_\infty) - 1} \in (1, \infty).$$

Now we formulate our main BMO-estimate:

Theorem 3.10. *Assume (C1)-(C8) for $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $p \in [2, \infty)$ as mentioned in (C8), and for some $0 \leq s < t \leq T$. Then there exists $c_{(3.10)} > 0$ depending at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}})$ such that for any stopping time $\sigma \in [s, t]$*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma} |Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p \leq (c_{(3.10)} w_{p,s,\sigma,t})^p, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_{p,s,u,t}^p &= \left(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi + w_{p,s,u,t}^f \right) + \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^t |f(r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p \\ &\quad + (t - u)^p \left[\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(|\xi| + \int_t^T |f(r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Section 5.2 below □

The main application of Theorem 3.10 is the general tail estimate:

Theorem 3.11. *With the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.10, there exists $c > 0$ such that for any stopping time $\sigma \in [s, t]$ one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\sigma, t]} \frac{|Y_u - Y_\sigma|}{C(3.10)} > \lambda + c\mu\nu \right) &\leq e^{1-\mu} \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\sigma, t]} \frac{|Y_u - Y_\sigma|}{C(3.10)} > \lambda \right) \\ &\quad + c \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\sigma, t]} w_{p,s,u,t} > \nu \right), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda, \mu, \nu > 0$, and any $B \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma$ of positive measure.

Proof. See Section 5.3 below □

4 A couple of coupling results

Here we recall the coupling operators introduced in [15], as well as some of their properties proven there. These operators are defined for random objects based on $\overline{\Omega}$, see 4.1 below, but in the end of this section we show how we can still gain conditional estimates in the original probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. These results are crucial in proving Theorem 3.10.

4.1 Setting

Recall the stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]})$ that was fixed in the beginning of Section 2. Our fundamental random object is the Brownian motion $W = (W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, but for our coupling technique we also need to have a Brownian motion W' that is independent of W . Thus we proceed as follows:

1. Fix another stochastic basis

$$(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}', (\mathcal{F}'_t)_{t \in [0, T]})$$

that satisfies the usual assumptions, and in particular $\mathbb{F}' = (\mathcal{F}'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the augmented natural filtration of a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion $W' = (W'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, where all paths are assumed to be continuous, and $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}'_T$.

2. Let

$$\overline{\Omega} := \Omega \times \Omega', \quad \overline{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}', \quad \overline{\mathcal{F}} := \overline{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}'}^{\overline{\mathbb{P}}}.$$

3. Extend the Brownian motions W and W' canonically to $\overline{\Omega}$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} W(\omega, \omega') &:= W(\omega), \\ W'(\omega, \omega') &:= W'(\omega'). \end{aligned}$$

The augmented⁵ natural filtration of the $2d$ -dimensional Brownian motion (W, W') is denoted by $\overline{\mathbb{F}} = (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$.

Hence, working on the probability space $(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$, we have two d -dimensional independent Brownian motions W and W' .

Fix a Borel-measurable function $\varphi : (0, T] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We define another standard d -dimensional Brownian motion by

$$W_t^\varphi := \int_0^t \sqrt{1 - \varphi(u)^2} dW_u + \int_0^t \varphi(u) dW'_u, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and assume again continuity of all trajectories. The augmented natural filtration of W^φ will be denoted by $\mathbb{F}^\varphi = (\mathcal{F}_t^\varphi)_{t \in [0, T]}$, and the predictable σ -algebra on the stochastic basis $(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}_T^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}}, (\mathcal{F}_t^\varphi)_{t \in [0, T]})$ by $\mathcal{P}^\varphi$. Moreover, we use Σ_T^φ for $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{F}_T^\varphi$.

Denoting the function $\varphi \equiv 0$ simply by 0, we have that W^0 and (the extension of) W are indistinguishable. Since $\mathcal{F}^0$ contains all $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -nullsets, it follows that $(\mathcal{F}_t^0)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and the augmentation of $\sigma(W_r, r \in [0, t])_{t \in [0, T]}$ coincide. Thus, we may agree to use W^0 for the extension of W , and similarly we use W^1 for the extension of W' .

4.2 Decoupling operators

Now we summarize how the underlying Brownian motion of certain random objects is changed from W^0 to W^φ . The fact that our procedure is well-defined is not proven here; all the proofs can be found in [15].

1. For $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ take the canonical extension $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$, and consider the corresponding equivalence-class of $\mathcal{F}^0$ -measurable random variables $\xi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$.
2. Letting $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the family of finite differences of W^0 generated by Haar functions, there exists a $\sigma(g_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$ -measurable $\xi^0 \in \xi$.

⁵Whenever we augment a filtration in $\overline{\Omega}$, we augment it by $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -nullsets.

3. Defining $J : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $J(\eta) = (g_n(\eta))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, there exists a random variable $\hat{\xi} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that ξ^0 can be factorized through $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$:

$$\xi^0 : \overline{\Omega} \xrightarrow{J} \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \xrightarrow{\hat{\xi}} \mathbb{R}.$$

4. Defining J^φ analogously, but using W^φ instead of W^0 , we have that $\hat{\xi}(J^\varphi)$ is a well-defined $\sigma(g_n^\varphi, n \in \mathbb{N})$ -measurable random variable.
5. Finally, we let $\xi^\varphi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$ be the equivalence-class that contains all $\mathcal{F}^\varphi$ -measurable random variables that are $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. the same as $\hat{\xi}(J^\varphi)$.

It should be pointed out that the factorization and the approach used here is distributional, and does not require continuous paths or a gaussian distribution. As such, the approach might be useful also in other situations.

The procedure for $X \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \Sigma_T, \mathbb{P}_T)$ is basically the same; we change the randomness, but do nothing to the time component. We end up with $X^\varphi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$.

Our approach is strong enough to preserve continuity: Given $S \in \{0, T\}$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_S, \Sigma_S, \mathbb{P}_S; C(\mathbb{X}))$ we define $f^\varphi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}_S, \Sigma_S^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_S; C(\mathbb{X}))$ by taking the continuous modification⁶ of $(f(x)^\varphi)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$.

4.3 Basic properties

Usually we identify equivalence-classes and representatives, but we do make an exception when it is not clear with respect to what σ -algebra the equivalence-class is taken.

Even though our approach is quite "light", it is strong enough to preserve the structures that are relevant to our study. Predictability and adaptedness are transferred in the following sense:

Proposition 4.1 ([15, Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 2.8]).

- (i) If $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ for some $t \in [0, T]$, then all representatives of $\xi^\varphi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$ are $\mathcal{F}_t^\varphi$ -measurable.
- (ii) If $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{P}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$ ⁷, then there is a $\mathcal{P}^\varphi$ -measurable⁸ representative of $f^\varphi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$.
- (iii) If $Y \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; C([0, T]))$ is $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted, then all representatives of $Y^\varphi \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}}; C([0, T]))$ are $(\mathcal{F}_t^\varphi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted.

⁶Existence of such modification was proven in [15] using a "relative" of Proposition 6.3.

⁷i.e. $\eta \mapsto f(\eta, x)$ is $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

⁸i.e. $\eta \mapsto f^\varphi(\eta, x)$ is $\mathcal{P}^\varphi$ -measurable for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

We summarize some further properties proven in [15]:

Proposition 4.2 ([15, Theorems 2.6, 2.11, and Lemma 3.2]).

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $g : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Borel function, $S \in \{0, T\}$, $X, X_1, \dots, X_N \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_S, \Sigma_S, \mathbb{P}_S)$, $Y \in \mathcal{L}_1(\Omega_T, \Sigma_T, \mathbb{P}_T)$, $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_S, \Sigma_S, \mathbb{P}_S; C(\mathbb{R}^N))$, and $Z \in \mathcal{L}_2(\Omega_T, \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{P}_T)$. Then

- (i) $X \stackrel{d}{=} X^\varphi$.
- (ii) $(g(X_1, \dots, X_N))^\varphi = g(X_1^\varphi, \dots, X_N^\varphi)$.
- (iii) $(f(X_1, \dots, X_N))^\varphi = f^\varphi(X_1^\varphi, \dots, X_N^\varphi)$.
- (iv) $\left(\int_0^T Y(t) 1_{\{\int_0^T |Y(s)| ds < \infty\}} dt \right)^\varphi = \int_0^T Y^\varphi(t) 1_{\{\int_0^T |Y^\varphi(s)| ds < \infty\}} dt$.
- (v) $\left(\int_0^T Z(t) dW_t \right)^\varphi = \int_0^T Z^\varphi(t) dW_t^\varphi$, for any predictable representative of Z^φ .⁹
- (vi) Let $X \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \Sigma_T, \mathbb{P}_T)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^\varphi, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$. If there is a null-set $\mathcal{N} \subseteq [0, T]$ with $Y(t) = X(t)^\varphi$ for all $t \in [0, T] \setminus \mathcal{N}$, then $Y = X^\varphi$.

The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.2(ii):

Corollary 4.3. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \Sigma_T, \mathbb{P}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$, and $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous. Then $(f + g)^\varphi = f^\varphi + g^\varphi$, and $h \circ f^\varphi = (h \circ f)^\varphi$.

Also, for example, local Lipschitz-behaviour is preserved:

Lemma 4.4 ([15, Remark 3.4]).

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{P}_T; C(\mathbb{R}^N))$. If there exists a continuous $H : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$|f(\eta, x_0) - f(\eta, x_1)| \leq H(x_0, x_1)$$

for all $(\eta, x_0, x_1) \in \Omega_T \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}$, then there is a $\mathcal{P}^\varphi$ -measurable representative of f^φ such that **for all** $(\eta, x_0, x_1) \in \overline{\Omega}_T \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}$

$$|f^\varphi(\eta, x_0) - f^\varphi(\eta, x_1)| \leq H(x_0, x_1).$$

⁹By Proposition 4.1(ii) there exists such a representative.

For the sake of completeness, we give a result that was not formulated in [15]:

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow [0, T]$ be an $(\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ -stopping time. Then there exists a representative of σ^φ that is an $(\mathcal{F}_r^\varphi)_{r \in [0, T]}$ -stopping time.*

Proof. Proposition 4.2(i) implies that $\|\sigma^\varphi\|_\infty = \|\sigma\|_\infty$, so we fix a representative σ^φ such that $\sigma^\varphi(\omega) \in [0, T]$ for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$, and let $r \in [0, T]$. Proposition 4.2(ii) implies that we have for any representative of $(1_{\{\sigma \leq r\}})^\varphi$ that

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\{(1_{\{\sigma \leq r\}})^\varphi = 1\} \cap \{\sigma^\varphi \leq r\}) = 1.$$

The results follows from Proposition 4.1(i) and the fact that $\mathcal{F}_r^\varphi$ contains $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$. $\square$

Our next result states that if we have a strong solution of an SDE in the first space, then changing the randomness of the solution results into a strong solution of another SDE. Naturally, the randomness of the data is changed. Note that we do not assume uniqueness of the solution.

Proposition 4.6 ([15, Theorem 3.3]).

Assume that $f, g_i \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{P}_T; C(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$, $Z_i \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega_T, \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{P}_T)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, that $Y \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; C([0, T]))$ is $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted, and that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r, Z_r)| dr + \int_0^T |g(r, Y_r, Z_r)|^2 dr \right] < \infty.$$

If $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and

$$Y_u = \xi + \int_u^T f(r, Y_r, Z_r) dr - \int_u^T g(r, Y_r, Z_r) dW_r \quad (5)$$

for $u \in [0, T]$, $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., then fixing any predictable representatives of $f^\varphi, g_i^\varphi, Z_i^\varphi$, and $(\mathcal{F}_t^\varphi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted (continuous) representative of Y^φ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |f^\varphi(r, Y_r^\varphi, Z_r^\varphi)| dr + \int_0^T |g^\varphi(r, Y_r^\varphi, Z_r^\varphi)|^2 dr \right] < \infty,$$

and

$$Y_u^\varphi = \xi^\varphi + \int_u^T f^\varphi(r, Y_r^\varphi, Z_r^\varphi) dr - \int_u^T g^\varphi(r, Y_r^\varphi, Z_r^\varphi) dW_r^\varphi \quad (6)$$

for $u \in [0, T]$, $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.

4.4 Conditional results

We start with a nice observation:

Lemma 4.7. *Let $X \in \mathcal{L}_1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $u \in [0, T]$. Then $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.*

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right)^\varphi = \mathbb{E} \left[X^\varphi \mid \mathcal{F}_u^\varphi \right].$$

Proof. Proposition 4.1(i) implies that there is an $\mathcal{F}_u^\varphi$ -measurable representative of $\left(\mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right)^\varphi$, so we need to show that for all $A^\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_u^\varphi$

$$\int_{A^\varphi} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right)^\varphi d\bar{\mathbb{P}} = \int_{A^\varphi} X^\varphi d\bar{\mathbb{P}},$$

and using π -system theorem it suffices to consider sets of type $A^\varphi = \{W_{t_1}^\varphi \in B_1, \dots, W_{t_n}^\varphi \in B_n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i \leq u$, and $B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Now, with $A = \{W_{t_1} \in B_1, \dots, W_{t_n} \in B_n\}$ and using Proposition 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(1_{A^\varphi} X^\varphi) &= \mathbb{E}(1_A^\varphi X^\varphi) = \mathbb{E}(1_A X)^\varphi = \mathbb{E}(1_A X) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(1_A \mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(1_A \mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right)^\varphi \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(1_A^\varphi \left(\mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right)^\varphi \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(1_{A^\varphi} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{F}_u \right] \right)^\varphi \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

From now on we will exclusively use functions φ of the form

$$\chi_{(s,t]} : (0, T] \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \chi_{(s,t]}(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & , \text{ if } r \in (s, t], \\ 0 & , \text{ if } r \notin (s, t], \end{cases}$$

where $0 \leq s < t \leq T$. To keep the notation light, $X^{(s,t]}$ instead of $X^{\chi_{(s,t]}}$ is used. Recall that the random object $X^{(s,t]}$ is obtained by changing the underlying Brownian motion W^0 to an independent one on the interval $(s, t]$. Then, if X is independent of $\sigma(W_r^0 - W_s^0, r \in (s, t])$, we ought to have $X^{(s,t]} = X$. In what sense this is true, is answered next.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, and define the sigma-algebras*

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t &:= \sigma(W_r^0, r \in [0, s]) \vee \sigma(W_r^0 - W_t^0, r \in [t, T]) \vee \overline{\mathcal{N}}, \\ \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t &:= \mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t,\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ are the $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -nullsets. Then

- (i) $\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} X = \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} X^{(s,t]}$ for any $X \in L_1(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$,
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \alpha = \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \alpha^{(s,t]}$ for any $\alpha \in L_1(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$,
- (iii) $\alpha \in \alpha^{(s,t]}$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$,
- (iv) $X \in X^{(s,t]}$ for any $X \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$,
- (v) $f \in f^{(s,t]}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$.

Proof. First we let

$$(\mathcal{G}_s^t)^1 := \sigma(W_r^{(s,t]}, r \in [0, s]) \vee \sigma(W_r^{(s,t]} - W_t^{(s,t]}, r \in [t, T]) \vee \overline{\mathcal{N}}.$$

Then, similarly as in Proposition 4.1(i) (i.e. [15, Lemma 3.1]), we have that $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$ implies $\alpha^{(s,t]} \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}, (\mathcal{G}_s^t)^1, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$. Since by definition

$$W_r^{(s,t]} = \begin{cases} W_r^0 & : 0 \leq r \leq s \\ W_s^0 + W_r^1 - W_s^1 & : s \leq r \leq t \\ W_s^0 + (W_t^1 - W_s^1) + (W_r^0 - W_t^0) & : t \leq r \leq T \end{cases} \quad \overline{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.},$$

it follows that

$$\overline{\mathbb{P}}(W_r^{(s,t]} = W_r^0 \text{ for all } r \in [0, s]) = 1,$$

and

$$\overline{\mathbb{P}}(W_r^{(s,t]} - W_t^{(s,t]} = W_r^0 - W_t^0 \text{ for all } r \in [t, T]) = 1,$$

so that $(\mathcal{G}_s^t)^1 = \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t$.

(i): We need to prove that

$$\int_A X d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T = \int_A X^{(s,t]} d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T$$

for all $A \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t$. By linearity of the decoupling-operation we may assume that $X \geq 0$, and it is enough to consider A of the form

$$(r, \widetilde{W}) := (r, W_{s_1}^0, \dots, W_{s_n}^0, W_{t_1}^0 - W_t^0, \dots, W_{t_m}^0 - W_t^0) \in B_1 \times B_2,$$

where $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq s_i \leq s < t \leq t_j \leq T$, $0 \leq r \leq T$, and $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}([0, T])$, $B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{(n+m)d})$. Letting $Y(r, \omega) := \chi_{B_1 \times B_2}(r, \widetilde{W}(\omega))$ we have $Y \in \mathcal{L}_\infty(\overline{\Omega}_T, \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$, and $Y \in Y^{(s,t]}$ because of Proposition 4.2(ii) and (vi). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A X d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T &= \int_{\overline{\Omega}_T} XY d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T = \int_{\overline{\Omega}_T} (XY)^{(s,t]} d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T = \int_{\overline{\Omega}_T} X^{(s,t]} Y^{(s,t]} d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T \\ &= \int_{\overline{\Omega}_T} X^{(s,t]} Y d\overline{\mathbb{P}}_T. \end{aligned}$$

(ii): Can be shown similarly as **(i)**.

(iii): First let $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_1(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$, and fix a $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t$ -measurable $\beta \in \alpha^{(s,t]}$. Since **(ii)** implies $\overline{\mathbb{P}}(\alpha = \beta) = 1$, we have that $\alpha \in \alpha^{(s,t]}$. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$ the claim follows from the fact that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(N \wedge \alpha \vee (-N))^{(s,t]} = N \wedge \alpha^{(s,t]} \vee (-N).$$

(iv): If $X \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$, then by Fubini's theorem $X(r) \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$ for all $r \in [0, T]$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t \subseteq \Sigma_T^{(s,t]}$, the claim follows from **(iii)** and Proposition 4.2(vi).

(v): Follows directly from **(iv)** and the definition of $f^{(s,t]}$. $\square$

We want to deduce conditional estimates for random variables defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ from estimates obtained using the coupling-technique. In this respect, the following result is vital:

Lemma 4.9. *Let $p \geq 1$, $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, and $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_p(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{2^p} \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} |\xi - \xi^{(s,t]}|^p \leq \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} |\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \xi|^p \leq \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} |\xi - \xi^{(s,t]}|^p. \quad (7)$$

Proof. We know from [15, Lemma 4.20] that for any $X \in \mathcal{L}_p(\overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$

$$\frac{1}{2} \|X - X^{(s,t]}\|_p \leq \|X - \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} X\|_p \leq \|X - X^{(s,t]}\|_p. \quad (8)$$

Let $A \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t$ such that $\overline{\mathbb{P}}(A) > 0$. Using Propositions 4.2(ii) and 4.8(iii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\xi \chi_A)^{(s,t]} &= \chi_A \xi^{(s,t]}, \\ \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t}(\xi \chi_A) &= \chi_A \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \xi, \end{aligned}$$

so that applying equation (8) with $X = \xi \chi_A$ implies the claim. $\square$

Applying $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0}$ on equation (7) we have:

$$\frac{1}{2^p} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0} |\xi - \xi^{(s,t]}|^p \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0} |\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \xi|^p \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0} |\xi - \xi^{(s,t]}|^p. \quad (9)$$

Remark 4.10. Lemma 4.9 can be applied to show that conditional quantities (based on Ω) and conditional quantities defined through decoupling (based on $\bar{\Omega}$) are equivalent: Let $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{L}_0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and denote their canonical extensions by $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\Psi}$, respectively. Then $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_p(\bar{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}^0, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$, and the canonical extension of $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s}|\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}_s^t}\xi|^p$ is $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. equal to $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0}|\tilde{\xi} - \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathcal{G}}_s^t}\tilde{\xi}|^p$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 4.9 that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0}|\xi - \xi^{(s,t)}|^p \leq \tilde{\Psi} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s}|\xi - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}_s^t}\xi|^p \leq \Psi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0}|\xi - \xi^{(s,t)}|^p \leq 2^p \tilde{\Psi}.$$

The same idea applies also for the generator-quantity. However, because the result corresponding to Lemma 4.9 is more technically involved, we only mention that the following is a consequence of Proposition 6.8.

Corollary 4.11. *Let $q \geq 1$, $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, and assume that $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\bar{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \bar{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$ satisfies (C2) with $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and (C3) with $p = 1$. Then $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0} \left(\int_s^T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |f(r, x) - f^{(s,t)}(r, x)| dr \right)^q \\ & \sim_{2^q} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_s^0} \left(\int_s^T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |f(r, x) - (\mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f)(r, x)| dr \right)^q, \end{aligned}$$

whenever either side is in $L_1(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$.

5 Proofs of main results

We will prove most of our main results using the technique introduced in Section 4, which means we will be working in the probability space $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$. The assumptions (C1)-(C7) are imposed in the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, but then they hold, in the proper sense, also in the probability space $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$. It is quite straightforward to handle (C1)-(C5):

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that $(f, Y, Z, (\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$ satisfy assumptions (C1)-(C4) with constants (θ, p, L_y, L_z) . Then $(f^{(s,t)}, Y^{(s,t)}, Z^{(s,t)}, (\mathcal{F}_r^{(s,t)})_{r \in [0, T]})$ and the canonical extensions $(f, Y, Z, (\mathcal{F}_r^0)_{r \in [0, T]})$ satisfy assumptions (C1)-(C4) with constants (θ, p, L_y, L_z) .*

Proof. That (C1)-(C4) are satisfied by the canonical extensions is trivial, and that they are satisfied by $(f^{(s,t)}, Y^{(s,t)}, Z^{(s,t)}, (\mathcal{F}_r^{(s,t)})_{r \in [0, T]})$ follows from Propositions 4.1, 4.2, and Lemma 4.4. $\square$

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that $(Z, (\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$ satisfy assumption (C5) with parameter $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Then $(Z^{(s, t]}, (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$ and $(Z, (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$ satisfy assumption (C5) with parameter θ . Moreover, we have $\text{sl}_N^{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}(|Z^{(s, t]}|^\theta) \leq \text{sl}_N(|Z|^\theta)$ and $\text{sl}_N^{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}(|Z|^\theta) \leq \text{sl}_N(|Z|^\theta)$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. We apply Lemma 6.2 below with $\mathcal{G} := \sigma(\overline{W}_r - \overline{W}_t, r \in [t, T])$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 := \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t$. Choosing $\mathcal{G}_1 := \mathcal{F}_t^0$, Lemma 6.2 implies that (C5) holds for $(Z, (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$. As for $(Z^{(s, t]}, (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_r)_{r \in [0, T]})$, choosing $\mathcal{G}_1 := \mathcal{F}_t^{(s, t]}$ in Lemma 6.2 and using Lemma 4.7 together with Proposition 4.2(ii) and (iv)), we deduce for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $(\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ -stopping times σ, τ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t} \left(\int_t^T |Z_r|^{2\theta} \chi_{(\sigma, \tau]}(r) dr \right) \right)^{(s, t]} &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t^{(s, t]}} \left(\int_t^T |Z_r|^{2\theta} \chi_{(\sigma, \tau]}(r) dr \right)^{(s, t]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t} \left(\int_t^T |Z_r|^{2\theta} \chi_{(\sigma, \tau]}(r) dr \right)^{(s, t]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t} \left(\int_t^T |Z_r^{(s, t]}|^{2\theta} \chi_{(\sigma^{(s, t]}, \tau^{(s, t]})}(r) dr \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 4.5 we may assume that $\sigma^{(s, t]}$ and $\tau^{(s, t]}$ are $(\mathcal{F}_r^{(s, t]})_{r \in [0, T]}$ -stopping times, so the result follows. $\square$

The following is the counterpart of Assumption 3.8:

Assumption 5.3. *There are $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ such that there exist càdlàg $(\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \in [0, T]}$ -supermartingales whose canonical extensions $(\overline{w}_{p, s, u, t}^\xi)_{u \in [s, t]}$ and $(\overline{w}_{p, s, u, t}^f)_{u \in [s, t]}$ satisfy for any $u \in [s, t]$*

$$(\overline{\text{C6}}) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} |\xi - \xi^{(u, t]}|^p \leq \overline{w}_{p, s, u, t}^\xi,$$

$$(\overline{\text{C7}}) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{y, z} |f(r, y, z) - f^{(u, t]}(r, y, z)| dr \right)^p \leq \overline{w}_{p, s, u, t}^f.$$

It is immediate from Lemma 4.9 and Corollary 4.11 that Assumptions 3.8 and 5.3 are equivalent, and the corresponding weight processes differ by a multiplicative constant depending only on p .

5.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3.9:

(C1)-(C5) Follow from [5, Theorem 4.2], since (A_h) implies that (C2) holds with $\theta = 0$, $(A_{b, \sigma})$ together with (A_g) implies $\mathbb{E}|g(X_T)|^p < \infty$, and $(A_{b, \sigma})$ together with (A_h) implies $\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |h(r, X_r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p < \infty$.

(C6) Let $0 \leq s \leq u \leq t \leq T$. Using Proposition 4.2(ii) we have that

$$(g(X_T))^{(u,t]} = g(X_T^{(u,t]}),$$

and Proposition 4.6 implies that $X^{(u,t]}$ is the solution of

$$X_r^{(u,t]} = x + \int_0^r b(v, X_v^{(u,t]}) dv + \int_0^r \sigma(v, X_v^{(u,t]}) dW_v^{(u,t]}, \quad r \in [0, T].$$

Continuing with Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} |g(X_T) - g(X_T^{(u,t]})|^p &\leq L_g^p \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} |X_T - X_T^{(u,t]}|^p \\ &\leq L_g^p C_{6.1}^p (t - u)^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

(C7) Let $0 \leq s \leq u \leq t \leq T$. We notice that Proposition 4.2 implies

$$(h(r, X_r, y, z))^{(u,t]} = h(r, X_r^{(u,t]}, y, z).$$

Using (A_h) and Lemma 6.1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} \left(\int_0^T \sup_{y,z} |h(r, X_r, y, z) - h(r, X_r^{(u,t]}, y, z)| dr \right)^p \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} \left(\int_0^T L_h |X_r^{(u,t]} - X_r| dr \right)^p \leq T^p L_h^p C_{6.1}^p (t - u)^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence Assumption 5.3 holds for all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ with

$$\bar{w}_{p,s,u,t}^f = \bar{w}_{p,s,u,t}^\xi = C^p (t - u)^{p/2},$$

where C depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_g, L_h, L_{b,\sigma}, K_\sigma)$.

□

Proof of Theorem 3.1:

Because of Lemma 3.9 we may use Theorem 3.10 to obtain for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and any stopping time $\tau \in [s, t]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} |Y_t - Y_\tau|^p &\leq c_{(3.10)}^p \left(2c_{(3.9)}^p (t - \tau)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} \left(\int_\tau^t |h(r, X_r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (t - \tau)^p \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} \left(g(X_T)^p + \left(\int_t^T |h(r, X_r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using (A_g) , (A_h) and the fact

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} \sup_{\tau \leq r \leq T} |X_r|^p \leq C^p (1 + |X_\tau|^p),$$

where C depends at most on (T, p, K_b, K_σ) , we can go further and write

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau} |Y_t - Y_\tau|^p \leq c_{(3.1)}^p (t - \tau)^{p/2} [1 + |X_\tau|^p (t - \tau)^{p/2}].$$

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3.10

In this section we deduce an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma} |Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p$, where $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow [s, t]$ is any stopping time, and $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ are such that Assumption 3.8 is satisfied.

Our procedure consists of the following steps:

1: Let $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, $u \in [s, t]$, and consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |Y_t - Y_u|^p)^{1/p} &\leq (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |Y_t - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} Y_t|^p)^{1/p} + (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |Y_u - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} Y_t|^p)^{1/p} \\ &=: I_1^{1/p} + I_2^{1/p}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

2: With the assumptions of Theorem 3.10, Proposition 5.4 together with Lemma 4.9 implies

$$I_1 \leq c_{(5.4)}^p (w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi + w_{p,s,u,t}^f),$$

where $c_{(5.4)} > 0$ depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_N)$.

3: With the assumptions of Theorem 3.10, Proposition 5.6 implies that

$$I_2 \leq c_{(5.6)}^p w_{p,s,u,t}^p,$$

where $c_{(5.6)} > 0$ depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_N)$.

4: In the end we extend the result to stopping times.

The next Proposition is a conditional version of [15, Theorem 6.4]. Since the technique is already well-known, see e.g. [6, Proposition 2.3], we will not present all the details (these can be found in [15]), but only those parts that are of concern for us. Note that Assumption 3.8 is not needed for this result.

Proposition 5.4. *Assume (C1)-(C5) and (C8) for $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and $p \in [2, \infty)$ as written in (C8). Then for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and $u \in [0, T]$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathcal{F}}_u} \sup_{r \in [u, T]} |Y_r - Y_r^{(s,t)}|^p \\ &+ \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathcal{F}}_u} \left(\int_u^T 1_{(s,t)}(r) [|Z_r|^2 + |Z_r^{(s,t)}|^2] + [1 - 1_{(s,t)}(r)] |Z_r - Z_r^{(s,t)}|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq c_{(5.4)}^p \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathcal{F}}_u} \left(|\xi - \xi^{(s,t)}| + \int_u^T |f(r, Y_r, Z_r) - f^{(s,t)}(r, Y_r, Z_r)| dr \right)^p, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{(5.4)} > 0$ depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_N)$.

Proof. Note that we assume (C1)-(C5) for random objects based on Ω . Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 then imply that assumptions (C1)-(C5) also hold for the required objects based on $\bar{\Omega}$. We fix $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and let for $r \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta Y_r &:= Y_r - Y_r^{(s,t]}, \\
\Delta Z_r &:= (Z_r - Z_r^{(s,t]}(1 - 1_{(s,t]}(r)), -Z_r^{(s,t]} 1_{(s,t]}(r)), \\
\Delta \xi &:= \xi - \xi^{(s,t]}, \\
\Delta f_r &:= f(r, Y_r, Z_r) - f^{(s,t]}(r, Y_r^{(s,t]}, Z_r^{(s,t]}), \\
a_r &:= f(r, Y_r, Z_r) - f^{(s,t]}(r, Y_r, Z_r), \\
b_r &:= \frac{f^{(s,t]}(r, Y_r, Z_r) - f^{(s,t]}(r, Y_r^{(s,t]}, Z_r)}{\Delta Y_r} 1_{\{|\Delta Y_r| > 0\}}, \\
c_r &:= \frac{f^{(s,t]}(r, Y_r^{(s,t]}, Z_r) - f^{(s,t]}(r, Y_r^{(s,t]}, Z_r^{(s,t]})}{|\Delta Z_r|^2} 1_{\{|\Delta Z_r| > 0\}} \Delta Z_r, \\
\Xi_r &:= |\Delta \xi| + \int_r^T |a_r| dr.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $|b_r| \leq L_y$, and since

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta Z_r|^2 &= 1_{(s,t]}(r)[|Z_r^{(s,t]}|^2 + |Z_r|^2] + [1 - 1_{(s,t]}(r)]|Z_r^{(s,t]} - Z_r|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{|Z_r^{(s,t]} - Z_r|^2}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

we also have $|c_r| \leq \sqrt{2}L_z(1 + |Z_r|^\theta + |Z_r^{(s,t]}|^\theta)$ for all $r \in [0, T]$. It then follows from Lemmas 2.7 and 5.2 and assumption (C5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{sl}_{3N}^{\bar{\mathbb{F}}}(\mathbf{c}) &\leq \sqrt{2}L_z \left(\text{sl}_N^{\bar{\mathbb{F}}}(1) + \text{sl}_N^{\bar{\mathbb{F}}}(|Z|^\theta) + \text{sl}_N^{\bar{\mathbb{F}}}(|Z^{(s,t]}|^\theta) \right) \\
&\leq \sqrt{2}L_z \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} + 2s_N \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In case $s_\infty > 0$ we now pick $q > 1$ such that $\frac{\Phi^{-1}(2\sqrt{2}L_z s_\infty)}{\Phi^{-1}(2\sqrt{2}L_z s_\infty) - 1} < \frac{q}{q-1} < p$, and in case $s_\infty = 0$ we pick, for example, $q = \frac{3}{2}$. In both cases we have $\Phi(q) > 2\sqrt{2}L_z s_\infty \geq \text{sl}_\infty^{\bar{\mathbb{F}}}(\mathbf{c})$. Hence, letting $\bar{M}_t := \int_0^t c_r d\bar{W}_r$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have from Theorem 2.8 that $\mathcal{RH}_q^{\bar{\mathbb{F}}}(\mathcal{E}(\bar{M})) \leq c_{q, (s_N)_N} < \infty$, where the constant $c_{q, (s_N)_N}$ depends at most on $(q, \theta, L_z, (s_N)_N, T)$. Letting $d\nu := \mathcal{E}(\bar{M})_T d\mathbb{P}$ we have by Girsanov's theorem that

$$W^* = (W_r^*)_{r \in [0, T]} := \left(\bar{W}_r - \int_0^r c_u du \right)_{r \in [0, T]}$$

is a standard ν -Brownian motion, and we have

$$\Delta Y_u = \Delta \xi + \int_u^T [a_r + b_r \Delta Y_r] dr - \int_u^T \Delta Z_r dW_r^*$$

for all $u \in [0, T]$, $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. Applying Itô's formula and Hölder's inequality we deduce

$$|\Delta Y_u| \leq e^{(T-u)L_y} c_{q, (s_N)_N} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathcal{F}}_u} |\Xi_u|^{q'} \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}},$$

with $q' = \frac{q}{q-1}$. Letting $A \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_u$, Doob's maximal inequality implies

$$\left\| 1_A \sup_{r \in [u, T]} |\Delta Y_r| \right\|_p \leq c_{p, q'} \|\Xi_u 1_A\|_p \quad (11)$$

with $c_{p, q'} := e^{TL_y} c_{q, (s_N)_N} \left(\frac{p}{p-q'} \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\int_u^T |\Delta Y_r \Delta f_r| dr \leq C_y \sup_{r \in [u, T]} |\Delta Y_r|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_u^T |a_r| dr \right]^2 + \int_u^T |\Delta Y_r| |\Delta Z_r| |c_r| dr,$$

with $C_y = [\frac{1}{2} + TL_y]$. Using Itô's formula then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_u^T |\Delta Z_r|^2 dr &\leq |\Delta \xi|^2 + 2 \left| \int_u^T \Delta Y_r \Delta Z_r d\bar{W}_r \right| + 2 \int_u^T |\Delta Y_r \Delta f_r| dr \\ &\leq |\Xi_u|^2 + 2 \left| \int_u^T \Delta Y_r \Delta Z_r d\bar{W}_r \right| + 2C_y \sup_{r \in [u, T]} |\Delta Y_r|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \int_u^T |\Delta Y_r| |\Delta Z_r| |c_r| dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 2.9 we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T 1_A |\Delta Y_r| |\Delta Z_r| |c_r| dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \|c\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \bar{\mathbb{F}})}^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T 1_A |\Delta Y_r|^2 |\Delta Z_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality implies that for any $\gamma > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T 1_A \Delta Y_r \Delta Z_r d\overline{W}_r \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} &\leq \frac{\gamma \beta_{p/2}}{2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{r \in [u, T]} |\Delta Y_r|^p 1_A \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_{p/2}}{2\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T 1_A |\Delta Z_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting all these estimates together, we have that there exist constants $C = C(\theta, d, p, q, \gamma, L_y, L_z, T, (s_N)_N)$ and $c = c(d, p, L_z, T, (s_N)_N)$ such that

$$\left\| \left(1_A \int_u^T |\Delta Z_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \leq C \|\Xi_u 1_A\|_p + \frac{c}{\gamma} \left\| \left(1_A \int_u^T |\Delta Z_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p,$$

so the result follows by choosing $\gamma > c$. $\square$

Remark 5.5. It follows that assumption $(\overline{C7})$ can be weakened to:

$$(\widetilde{C7}) \quad \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u^0} \left(\int_u^T |f(r, Y_r, Z_r) - f^{(u,t]}(r, Y_r, Z_r)| dr \right)^p \leq \overline{w}_{p,s,u,t}^f,$$

where inside the conditional expectation we have the canonical extensions of these processes.

Proposition 5.6. With the same assumptions as in Proposition 5.4, and assuming that $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ are such that (C6) and (C7) are satisfied, we have for any $u \in [s, t]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq c_{(5.6)}^p \left(\|\chi_{(u,t]} |Z|^\theta\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{F})}^p + (t-u)^{p/2} \right) \left(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi + w_{p,s,u,t}^f \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^t |f(r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p + (t-u)^p \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(|\xi| + \int_u^T |f(r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{(5.6)} > 0$ depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_N)$.

Proof. We have directly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |Y_u - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} Y_t|^p &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left| \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \int_u^t f(r, Y_r, Z_r) dr \right|^p \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left| \int_u^t |f(r, 0, 0)| + L_y |Y_r| + L_z [1 + |Z_r|]^\theta |Z_r| dr \right|^p \\ &\leq C_p \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left[\left(\int_u^t |f(r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p + L_y^p (t-u)^p \sup_{r \in [u,t]} |Y_r|^p \right. \\ &\quad \left. + L_z^p \left(\int_u^t |Z_r| dr \right)^p + L_z^p \left(\int_u^t |Z_r|^{1+\theta} dr \right)^p \right]. \end{aligned}$$

With the same proof as that of Proposition 5.4, one can upper bound the second term by

$$C(t-u)^p \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(|\xi| + \int_u^T |f(r, 0, 0)| dr \right)^p,$$

where $C > 0$ depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_N)$. For the third term we may apply Proposition 5.4 and Assumption 3.8 to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^t |Z_r| dr \right)^p &\leq (t-u)^{p/2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^t |Z_r|^2 dr \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq c_{(5.4)}^p (t-u)^{p/2} \left(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi + w_{p,s,u,t}^f \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the last term we use Corollary 2.10, Proposition 5.4, and Assumptions 3.8 and (C5), to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^t |Z_r|^{1+\theta} dr \right)^p &\leq c_p \sup_{r \in [u,t]} \left\| \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_r} \int_r^t |Z_v|^{2\theta} dv \right\|_\infty^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \left(\int_u^t |Z_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq c_p \|\chi_{(u,t]} |Z|^\theta\|_{\text{BMO}(S_2, \mathbb{F})}^p c_{(5.4)}^p \left(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi + w_{p,s,u,t}^f \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we extend this result to hold for stopping times.

Proof of Theorem 3.10:

(i) Assume that (C1)-(C8) hold for $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $p \in [2, \infty)$ as in (C8), and $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ are such that Assumption 3.8 is satisfied. It follows directly from Propositions 5.4 and 5.6 that there exists $C > 0$ depending at most on $(T, d, p, L_y, L_z, (s_N)_N)$, such that for all $u \in [s, t]$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} |Y_t - Y_u|^p \leq C w_{p,s,u,t}^p.$$

Since $(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi)_{u \in [s,t]}$ and $(w_{p,s,u,t}^f)_{u \in [s,t]}$ are supermartingales, it follows that $(w_{p,s,u,t}^p)_{u \in [s,t]}$ as well is a supermartingale. Applying [18, Theorem 3.13, page 16] on $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_u} \int_u^t |f(r, 0, 0)| dr$, we deduce that $(w_{p,s,u,t}^p)_{u \in [s,t]}$ has a càdlàg modification, to which we will switch without changing the notation.

(ii) Assume that $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ is a stopping time for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n \leq t$. From step (i) we know that for all $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{s_i}} |Y_t - Y_{s_i}|^p \leq C w_{p,s,s_i,t}^p.$$

Now we have for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_A |Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p d\mathbb{P} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{A \cap \{\sigma = s_i\}} |Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{A \cap \{\sigma = s_i\}} |Y_t - Y_{s_i}|^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{A \cap \{\sigma = s_i\}} C w_{p,s,s_i,t}^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{A \cap \{\sigma = s_i\}} C w_{p,s,\sigma,t}^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_A C w_{p,s,\sigma,t}^p d\mathbb{P}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma} |Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p \leq C w_{p,s,\sigma,t}^p.$$

(iii) Let $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow [s, t]$ be a stopping time, and let $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of stopping times such that $\sigma_n(\omega) \downarrow \sigma(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, and $\sigma_n : \Omega \rightarrow [s, t]$ has a finite range. By step (ii) we know that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{\sigma_n}} |Y_t - Y_{\sigma_n}|^p \leq C w_{p,s,\sigma_n,t}^p. \quad (12)$$

Consider now the martingale

$$(M_r^n)_{r \in [s,t]} := \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|Y_t - Y_{\sigma_n}|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_r \right] \right)_{r \in [s,t]}.$$

By Optional stopping, and the fact that $\sigma \leq \sigma_n \leq t$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[M_{\sigma_n}^n \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma \right] = M_\sigma^n.$$

Moreover, using Optional stopping and the fact that $(w_{p,s,u,t}^\xi)_{u \in [s,t]}$ and $(w_{p,s,u,t}^f)_{u \in [s,t]}$ are right-continuous supermartingales, we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma} w_{p,s,\sigma_n,t}^p \leq w_{p,s,\sigma,t}^p.$$

Now, taking $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma}$ on both sides of (12), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\sigma} |Y_t - Y_{\sigma_n}|^p \leq C w_{p,s,\sigma,t}^p.$$

Since Y is right-continuous, we have for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_A \mathbb{E} \left[|Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma \right] d\mathbb{P} &= \int_A |Y_t - Y_\sigma|^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_A \lim_n |Y_t - Y_{\sigma_n}|^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \lim_n \int_A |Y_t - Y_{\sigma_n}|^p d\mathbb{P} \\
&\leq \lim_n \int_A C w_{p,s,\sigma,t}^p d\mathbb{P},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used dominated convergence, notice that

$$1_A |Y_t - Y_{\sigma_n}|^p \leq 1_A 2^p \sup_{r \in [0,t]} |Y_r|^p \in L_1.$$

□

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3.11

As mentioned earlier, Theorem 3.11 is a consequence of Theorem 3.10, and in the same way Theorem 3.2 follows from Theorem 3.1. The required tail estimate follows when we use Theorem 7.1 on suitable processes, so we will show that the assumptions of Theorem 7.1 follow from Theorem 3.10.

Proof of Theorem 3.11:

Fix $p \geq 2$ as described in (C8), and let $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ such that Assumption 3.8 holds. Let $\epsilon > 0$, $u \in [s, t]$, $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $R := t - u$. Define for $r \in [0, R]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_r &:= \mathcal{F}_{r+u}, \\
A_r &:= \frac{(Y_{r+u} - Y_u)\theta^{1/p}}{C(3.10)}, \\
\Psi_r &:= w_{p,s,r+u,t} \vee \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where w_p is the weight process from Theorem 3.10. For $0 \leq a < b$ and a filtration $(\mathcal{H}_r)_{r \in [a,b]}$ we introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{S}_{a,b}^{\mathcal{H}} := \left\{ \sigma : \Omega \rightarrow [a, b] \mid \sigma \text{ is a } (\mathcal{H}_r)_{r \in [a,b]} \text{-stopping time} \right\},$$

so that in particular $\mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}} + u = \mathcal{S}_{u,t}^{\mathcal{F}}$. Then the assumptions of Theorem 7.1 are fulfilled. As the other assumptions are obvious, we will only show that equation (15) holds. Using Theorem 3.10 we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|A_R - A_\sigma|^p}{\Psi_\sigma^p} \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right] \right\|_\infty \\
& \leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|Y_t - Y_{\sigma+u}|^p}{w_{p,s,\sigma+u,t}^p \vee \epsilon^p} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma+u} \right] \right\|_\infty \frac{\theta}{c_{(3.10)}^p} \\
& = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{u,t}^{\mathcal{F}}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|Y_t - Y_\tau|^p}{w_{p,s,\tau,t}^p \vee \epsilon^p} \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \right\|_\infty \frac{\theta}{c_{(3.10)}^p} \\
& \leq \theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have for any $\nu > 0$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}$, and $B \in \mathcal{G}_\sigma$ of positive measure, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_B(|A_R - A_\sigma| > \nu) & \leq \mathbb{P}_B(|A_R - A_\sigma| > \Psi_\sigma) + \mathbb{P}_B(\Psi_\sigma > \nu) \\
& \leq \theta + \mathbb{P}_B(\Psi_\sigma > \nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ implies the claim. $\square$

6 Appendix

Our first Lemma is a quantitative BMO-estimate for the process X introduced in Section 3.1. The proof is the same as that of [13, Theorem 2.5].

Lemma 6.1. *Assume $(A_{b,\sigma})$, let $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, and $p \geq 2$. Then there exists $C_{6.1} > 0$ depending at most on $(T, d, p, L_{b,\sigma}, K_\sigma)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [s, T]} |X_r^{(s,t]} - X_r|^p \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_s \right] \leq C_{6.1}^p (t - s)^{p/2}.$$

Proof. Using Proposition 4.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
X_r^{(s,t]} - X_r &= \int_s^r b(u, X_u^{(s,t]}) - b(u, X_u) du + \int_s^r \sigma(u, X_u^{(s,t]}) 1_{(s,t]}(u) dW_u^1 \\
&\quad - \int_s^r \sigma(u, X_u) 1_{(s,t]}(u) dW_u^0 \\
&\quad + \int_s^r (\sigma(u, X_u^{(s,t]}) - \sigma(u, X_u)) (1 - 1_{(s,t]}(u)) dW_u^0
\end{aligned}$$

for all $r \in [s, T]$, $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. Next we let $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_s$ with $\overline{\mathbb{P}}(A) > 0$, and define $g : [s, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$g(v) := \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \leq r \leq v} |X_r^{(s,t]} - X_r|^p 1_A \right) = \int_A \sup_{s \leq r \leq v} |X_r^{(s,t]} - X_r|^p d\overline{\mathbb{P}}.$$

Using basic inequalities we have for all $v \in [s, T]$

$$g(v) \leq C(t-s)^{p/2} \overline{\mathbb{P}}(A) + C \int_s^v g(u) du,$$

where the constant C depends at most on $(T, d, p, L_{b,\sigma}, K_\sigma)$. The result follows from Gronwall's lemma. $\square$

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be σ -algebras in $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_1 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_2 \right]$$

for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Then for any $X \in L_1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1 \vee \mathcal{G} \right] \mid \mathcal{G}_2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1 \right]. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Using properties of the conditional expectation it suffices to prove the claim for X that is $\mathcal{G}_1 \vee \mathcal{G}$ -measurable and bounded. Letting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &:= \left\{ X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid X \text{ is bounded and such that (13) holds} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{H}_0 &:= \left\{ X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid X = 1_A 1_G, \text{ where } A \in \mathcal{G}_1, G \in \mathcal{G} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we have $\mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[1_A 1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_1 \right] &= 1_A \mathbb{E} \left[1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_1 \right] \\ &= 1_A \mathbb{E} \left[1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[1_A 1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[1_A 1_G \mid \mathcal{G}_1 \vee \mathcal{G} \right] \mid \mathcal{G}_2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from properties of conditional expectation that

- (i) $\mathcal{H}$ is a vector space,
- (ii) constants are included in $\mathcal{H}$,
- (iii) if $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-negative, increasing, $X_n \in \mathcal{H}$, and $X := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ is bounded, then $X \in \mathcal{H}$,
- (iv) $XY \in \mathcal{H}_0$ whenever $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}_0$.

Hence, the pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_0)$ satisfies assumptions of [28, Theorem 2.2], which implies that $\mathcal{H}$ contains all bounded $\sigma(\mathcal{H}_0)$ -measurable functions. Since $\mathcal{G}_1 \vee \mathcal{G} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{H}_0)$, the claim follows. $\square$

We need the following technical construction. By continuity of a stochastic process $(f(x))_{x \in \mathbb{X}} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we understand that $x \mapsto f(\omega, x)$ is continuous for all $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $(f(x))_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$ be a continuous stochastic process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, such that $(f(x))_{x \in K}$ is uniformly integrable for every compact $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Furthermore, assume that there exists a continuous $H : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $H(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$, and*

$$|f(\omega, x_0) - f(\omega, x_1)| \leq H(x_0, x_1)$$

for all $(\omega, x_0, x_1) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a sub-sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{F}$, then there exists a unique¹⁰ $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable continuous stochastic process $((\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} f)(x))_{x \in \mathbb{X}} := (g(x))_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}(f(x)) = g(x)) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Proof. (i): Let $\mathbb{A} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be a countable dense set, K be one of the sets K_n , and $\mathbb{A}_0 := \mathbb{A} \cap K$. Let for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{u,v}^n &:= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid |\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}(f(u))(\omega) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}(f(v))(\omega)| \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\}, \\ B_{u,v}^n &:= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}|f(u) - f(v)|(\omega) \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\}, \\ N_{u,v}^n &:= B_{u,v}^n \setminus A_{u,v}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Then $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}(f(x))(\omega)$ is (uniformly) continuous in $\mathbb{A}_0$ if and only if

$$\omega \in \Omega^0 := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0, \\ d(u, v) < \frac{1}{m}}} A_{u,v}^n,$$

so we want to show that $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^0) = 1$. Since $\mathbb{P}(N_{u,v}^n) = 0$, it suffices to show that

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0, \\ d(u, v) < \frac{1}{m}}} B_{u,v}^n \tag{14}$$

is of measure one. Let for all $u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$

$$X_{u,v}(\omega) := |f(\omega, u) - f(\omega, v)|.$$

¹⁰Unique up to indistinguishability.

Next fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and pick $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0$ with $d(u, v) < \frac{1}{m}$, we have $X_{u,v}(\omega) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. The integer m can be taken as follows: We use the notation $d^2((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1)) := \max\{d(x_0, x_1), d(y_0, y_1)\}$ for $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{X}$. Since $K \times K$ is compact we have that H is uniformly continuous on $K \times K$, and this implies for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\sup \left\{ \delta > 0 \mid |H(z) - H(w)| < \epsilon \quad \forall z, w \in K \times K \text{ with } d^2(z, w) \leq \delta \right\} > 0.$$

It also holds for all $\epsilon > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup \left\{ \delta > 0 \mid |H(z) - H(w)| < \epsilon \quad \forall z, w \in K \times K \text{ with } d^2(z, w) \leq \delta \right\} \\ & \leq \sup \left\{ \delta > 0 \mid H(x, y) < \epsilon \quad \forall x, y \in K \text{ with } d(x, y) < \delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads us to choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$0 < \frac{1}{m} < \sup \left\{ \delta > 0 \mid H(x, y) < \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall x, y \in K \text{ with } d(x, y) < \delta \right\}.$$

To prove that the expression in (14) is of measure one, we show that with these n and m ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} X_{u,v} \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0 \text{ with } d(u, v) < \frac{1}{m} \right) = 1.$$

Assuming the contrary gives $u, v \in \mathbb{A}_0$ with $d(u, v) < \frac{1}{m}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} X_{u,v} > \frac{1}{n}) > 0$. Letting for $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$B_k := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} X_{u,v})(\omega) > \frac{1}{n - \frac{1}{k}} \right\},$$

we then have that there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(B_k) > 0$ for all $k \geq k_0$. From the fact $B_k \in \mathcal{G}$ we deduce for all $k \geq k_0$

$$\frac{1}{n - \frac{1}{k}} \mathbb{P}(B_k) \leq \int_{B_k} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} X_{u,v} d\mathbb{P} = \int_{B_k} X_{u,v} d\mathbb{P} \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}(B_k),$$

which is a contradiction with $\mathbb{P}(B_k) > 0$. Now we can define for all $x \in K$

$$g(x)(\omega) := \begin{cases} \lim_{\substack{x_n \rightarrow x, \\ x_n \in \mathbb{A}_0}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}}(f(x_n))(\omega) & : \omega \in \Omega^0 \\ 0 & : \omega \in \Omega \setminus \Omega^0 \end{cases},$$

and arrive to a process $(g(x))_{x \in K}$ that satisfies:

1. $x \mapsto g(\omega, x)$ is continuous for all $\omega \in \Omega$,
2. $\omega \mapsto g(\omega, x)$ is $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable for all $x \in K$,
3. $\mathbb{P}(g(x_n) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} f(x_n)) = 1$ for all $x_n \in \mathbb{A}_0$.

What we still need to show is $\mathbb{P}(g(x) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} f(x)) = 1$ for all $x \in K$. We have for any $x \in K$ and $\mathbb{A}_0 \ni x_n \rightarrow x$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |g(x_n) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} f(x)| d\mathbb{P} &= \int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} f(x_n) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} f(x)| d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{G}} |f(x_n) - f(x)| d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |f(x_n) - f(x)| d\mathbb{P} \rightarrow_n 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that f is uniformly integrable in K .

(ii): Defining $(g^{K_n}(x))_{x \in K_n}$ and $(g^{K_{n+1}}(x))_{x \in K_{n+1}}$ as in step **(i)**, we have that g^{K_n} and $g^{K_{n+1}}$ are indistinguishable in K_n . Hence, we can consistently define one process in $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \mathbb{X}$. $\square$

We continue with a small observation that will be frequently used:

Lemma 6.4. *If $h : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, then $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} h(x) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{A}} h(x)$. Furthermore, if $f_1, f_2 \in [f] \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \overline{\Sigma}_T, \overline{\mathbb{P}}; C(\mathbb{X}))$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f_2(r, y)| dr = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f_1(r, y)| dr.$$

Given a probability space $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$, the space of equivalence classes $L_0(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ can be equipped with the metric

$$d(X, X') := \int_{\hat{\Omega}} \frac{|X - X'|}{1 + |X - X'|} d\hat{\mathbb{P}}.$$

It is proven in [15, Theorem 2.6.(1)] that the coupling-operation is an isometry. This means that given $S \in \{0, T\}$ it follows for any $X, Y \in L_0(\overline{\Omega}_S, \Sigma_S^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_S)$ that $d(X, Y) = d(X^\varphi, Y^\varphi)$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $S \in \{0, T\}$, $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_S, \Sigma_S^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_S; C(\mathbb{X}))$, and put*

$$g(\eta, y) := f(\eta, y) 1_{\{\eta \in \overline{\Omega}_S \mid \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} f(\eta, x) \in \mathbb{R}\}}.$$

Then $g \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_S, \Sigma_S^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_S; C(\mathbb{X}))$ and

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} g^\varphi(y) = (\sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} g(y))^\varphi.$$

Proof. Lemma 6.4 implies the first claim. Since $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} g(\eta, y) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\eta \in \overline{\Omega}_S$, we have that $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} g(y) \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_S, \Sigma_S^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_S)$.

Since $\mathbb{A}$ is countable, we can fix finite sets $\mathbb{A}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{A}_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ such that $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{A}_n = \mathbb{A}$. Using Proposition 4.2(ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} d \left(\left(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} g(y) \right)^\varphi, \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}_k} g^\varphi(y) \right) &= d \left(\left(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} g(y) \right)^\varphi, \left(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}_k} g(y) \right)^\varphi \right) \\ &= d \left(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} g(y), \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}_k} g(y) \right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The result follows since $(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}_k} g^\varphi(y))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing. $\square$

In what follows we will only need:

Lemma 6.6. [15, Remark 2.7(2)]

Let $X \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$ such that $\int_0^T |X(t)| dt$ is $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. finite. Then

$$\int_0^T X^\varphi(t) dt = \left(\int_0^T X(t) dt \right)^\varphi.$$

Corollary 6.7. Let $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$ such that

$$\overline{\mathbb{P}} \left(\left\{ \omega \in \overline{\Omega} \mid \int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f(r, \omega, y)| dr < \infty \right\} \right) = 1.$$

Then

$$\int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f^\varphi(r, y)| dr = \left(\int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f(r, y)| dr \right)^\varphi.$$

Proof. We have from Corollary 4.3 that $|f^\varphi| = |f|^\varphi$, Lemma 6.5 implies $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f|^\varphi(y) = (\sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f|(y))^\varphi$, and finally, Lemma 6.6 gives us $\int_0^T (\sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f|(y))^\varphi(r) dr = (\int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}} |f|(r, y) dr)^\varphi$. $\square$

We are ready to prove the desired result:

Proposition 6.8. Let $p \geq 1$, $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, and $f \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$ such that $(f(x))_{x \in K}$ is uniformly integrable for every compact $K \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and there exists a continuous $H : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $H(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$, and

$$|f(\eta, x_0) - f(\eta, x_1)| \leq H(x_0, x_1)$$

for all $(\eta, x_0, x_1) \in \overline{\Omega}_T \times \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$. Given $u \in [0, T]$ we have that $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} |f(r, x) - f^{(s,t]}(r, x)| dr \right)^p \\ &\sim_{2^p} \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} |f(r, x) - (\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f)(r, x)| dr \right)^p, \end{aligned}$$

whenever either side is in $L_1(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$.

Proof. Step 1: Fix $g \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{X}))$, and assume that

$$\left\| \int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |g(r, y) - f(r, y)| dr \right\|_p < \infty.$$

Lemma 4.8(v) gives $g \in g^{(s,t]}$, so Corollary 6.7 in particular implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |g(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \right)^p = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |g(r, y) - f(r, y)| dr \right)^p.$$

From this we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \right\|_p \\ & \leq \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - g(r, y)| dr \right\|_p + \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |g(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \right\|_p \\ & = 2 \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - g(r, y)| dr \right\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: We assume $\| \int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \|_p < \infty$, recall that W^0, W^1 denote the canonical extensions of W, W' , respectively, and for $0 \leq a < b \leq T$ work with the σ -algebras

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{a,b}^{W^0} &:= \mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \sigma(W_r^0 - W_a^0, r \in [a, b]), \\ \mathcal{H}_{a,b}^{W^1} &:= \mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \sigma(W_r^1 - W_a^1, r \in [a, b]), \\ \mathcal{H} &:= \{\emptyset, [0, T]\} \otimes \sigma(W_r^0 - W_s^0, r \in [s, t]). \end{aligned}$$

Note that these are σ -algebras in $\overline{\Omega}_T$, and we have the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{0,T}^{W^0} &\subseteq \Sigma_T, \\ \mathcal{H}_{0,s}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}_{s,t}^{W^1} \vee \mathcal{H}_{t,T}^{W^0} &\subseteq \Sigma_T^{(s,t]}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{0,s}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}_{t,T}^{W^0} &\subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t, \end{aligned}$$

where the sides differ only by nullsets. Using Lemma 6.4 we may assume that

1. f is $\mathcal{H}_{0,T}^{W^0}$ -measurable,
2. $f^{(s,t]}$ is $\mathcal{H}_{0,s}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}_{s,t}^{W^1} \vee \mathcal{H}_{t,T}^{W^0}$ -measurable,
3. $\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f^{(s,t]}$ is $\mathcal{H}_{0,s}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}_{t,T}^{W^0}$ -measurable.

Then the facts that for all $y \in \mathbb{A}$

$$\mathcal{H}_{0,s}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}_{t,T}^{W^0} \vee \sigma(f^{(s,t]}(y)) \text{ is independent of } \mathcal{H},$$

$$f(y) \text{ is } \mathcal{H}_{0,s}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}_{t,T}^{W^0} \vee \mathcal{H}\text{-measurable,}$$

are immediate. Hence, it follows from [30, 9.7.(k)] that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t \vee \mathcal{H}} f^{(s,t]}(y) = \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f^{(s,t]}(y)$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{A}$. Since $f(y) \in L_1(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{A}$, it follows from Proposition 4.8(i) that $\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f(y) = \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f^{(s,t]}(y)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{A}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - (\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f)(r, y)| dr \right\|_p \\ &= \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - (\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f^{(s,t]})(r, y)| dr \right\|_p \\ &= \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - (\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t \vee \mathcal{H}} f^{(s,t]})(r, y)| dr \right\|_p \\ &= \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t \vee \mathcal{H}}(f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y))| dr \right\|_p \\ &\leq \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t \vee \mathcal{H}} |f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \right\|_p \\ &\leq \left\| \int_u^T \mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t \vee \mathcal{H}} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| \right) dr \right\|_p \\ &= \left\| \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}^0} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \right) \right\|_p \\ &\leq \left\| \int_u^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, y) - f^{(s,t]}(r, y)| dr \right\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: The conditional claim follows from the result with the full expectation as in Lemma 4.9. We have already proven that for all $u \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, x) - f^{(s,t]}(r, x)| dr \right)^p \\ & \sim_{2p} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_u^T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{A}} |f(r, x) - (\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s^t} f)(r, x)| dr \right)^p, \end{aligned}$$

whenever either side is finite. Let $B \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_s^t$ with $\overline{\mathbb{P}}(B) > 0$, and define

$$\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{L}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T, \Sigma_T^0, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_T; C(\mathbb{X})) \text{ by } \tilde{f}(r, \omega, x) := f(r, \omega, x) 1_B(\omega).$$

If we fix a representative of $f^{(s,t]}$, then

1. $\tilde{f}$ satisfies the assumptions of our result,
2. $1_B(\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s} f)$ is a representative of $(\mathbb{E}^{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_s} \tilde{f})$,
3. $1_B f^{(s,t]}$ is a representative of $\tilde{f}^{(s,t]}$,

and the claim follows. $\square$

7 Appendix: weighted BMO

Fix $R > 0$, $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}_R, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{G}_r)_{r \in [0, R]})$ a stochastic basis that satisfies the usual assumptions, and $A = (A_r)_{r \in [0, R]}$ a continuous, adapted stochastic process with $A_0 = 0$. Moreover, we assume that $(\Psi_r)_{r \in [0, R]}$ is a càdlàg $(\mathcal{G}_r)_{r \in [0, R]}$ -adapted stochastic process, such that $\Psi_r(\omega) > 0$ for all $(r, \omega) \in \Omega_R$. Put

$$\mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}} := \left\{ \sigma : \Omega \rightarrow [0, R] \mid \sigma \text{ is a } (\mathcal{G}_r)_{r \in [0, R]} \text{-stopping time} \right\},$$

and define

$$W_{\Psi}(B, \nu; \sigma) := \mathbb{P} \left(B \cap \left\{ \sup_{u \in [\sigma, R]} \Psi_u > \nu \right\} \right),$$

for $\nu > 0$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}$, and $B \in \mathcal{G}_{\sigma}$. Recall that for $B \in \mathcal{G}_R$ of positive measure

$$\mathbb{P}_B(\cdot) := \frac{\mathbb{P}(B \cap \cdot)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}.$$

Theorem 7.1 ([14, Theorem 1]). *Assume that there is $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_B(|A_R - A_{\sigma}| > \nu) \leq \theta + \frac{W_{\Psi}(B, \nu; \sigma)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} \quad (15)$$

for all $\nu > 0$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}$, and $B \in \mathcal{G}_{\sigma}$ of positive measure. Then there are constants $a, \alpha > 0$, depending on θ only, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\sigma, R]} |A_u - A_{\sigma}| > \lambda + a\mu\nu \right) \\ & \leq e^{1-\mu} \mathbb{P}_B \left(\sup_{u \in [\sigma, R]} |A_u - A_{\sigma}| > \lambda \right) + \alpha \frac{W_{\Psi}(B, \nu; \sigma)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda, \mu, \nu > 0$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}$, and $B \in \mathcal{G}_{\sigma}$ of positive measure.

Proof. Fix $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{0,R}^{\mathcal{G}}$, $B \in \mathcal{G}_{\sigma}$ of positive measure, and let for $\lambda > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\lambda} &:= \inf \left\{ r \in [\sigma, R] \mid |A_r - A_{\sigma}| \geq \lambda \right\} \wedge R, \\ B_{\lambda} &:= B \cap \left\{ \sup_{r \in [\sigma, R]} |A_r - A_{\sigma}| \geq \lambda \right\} \in \mathcal{G}_{\sigma_{\lambda}}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for any $\lambda, \nu > 0$

$$B_{\lambda+\nu} \subseteq B_{\lambda} \cap \{|A_{\sigma_{\lambda+\nu}} - A_{\sigma_{\lambda}}| \geq \nu\},$$

from which we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(B_{\lambda+\nu}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(B_{\lambda} \cap \{|A_{\sigma_{\lambda+\nu}} - A_R| > \frac{\nu}{2}\}) + \mathbb{P}(B_{\lambda} \cap \{|A_R - A_{\sigma_{\lambda}}| \geq \frac{\nu}{2}\}) \\ &\leq \theta \mathbb{P}(B_{\lambda}) + W_{\Psi}(B_{\lambda}, \frac{\nu}{2}; \sigma_{\lambda+\nu}) + \theta \mathbb{P}(B_{\lambda}) + W_{\Psi}(B_{\lambda}, \frac{\nu}{3}; \sigma_{\lambda}) \\ &\leq 2\theta \mathbb{P}(B_{\lambda}) + 2W_{\Psi}(B_{\lambda}, \frac{\nu}{3}; \sigma).\end{aligned}$$

Next we iterate this estimate. Let

$$\begin{aligned}g &:= \sup_{u \in [\sigma, R]} |A_u - A_{\sigma}|, \\ V(C, \nu) &:= 2 \frac{W_{\Psi}(B \cap C, \frac{\nu}{3}; \sigma)}{\mathbb{P}(B \cap C)},\end{aligned}$$

for any $C \in \mathcal{G}_R$ of positive measure, and $V(C, \nu) := 0$ if $\mathbb{P}(B \cap C) = 0$.

Putting $\eta := 2\theta$, we have proven that

$$\mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda + \nu) \leq [\eta + V(g > \lambda, \nu)] \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda)$$

for $\lambda, \nu > 0$. Now we use the fact

$$V(C_1, \nu) \mathbb{P}_B(C_1) \leq V(C_2, \nu) \mathbb{P}_B(C_2)$$

for $C_1 \subseteq C_2$ to deduce

$$\mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda + N\nu) \leq \left[\eta^N + V(g > \lambda, \nu) \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \eta^{k-1} \right) \right] \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda)$$

for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda + N\nu) \leq \eta^N \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda) + \frac{1}{1-\eta} V(g > \lambda, \nu) \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda).$$

Letting $b := 1 \vee \frac{-1}{\log \eta}$ this implies for $\lambda, \nu, \mu > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda + \mu\nu) &\leq e^{1-\frac{\mu}{b}} \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda) + \frac{1}{1-\eta} V(g > \lambda, \nu) \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda) \\ &= e^{1-\frac{\mu}{b}} \mathbb{P}_B(g > \lambda) + \frac{2}{1-\eta} \frac{W_\Psi(B \cap \{g > \lambda\}, \frac{\nu}{3}; \sigma)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Acknowledgment: The author wishes to express his gratitude to his supervisor Stefan Geiss for helpful discussions and suggestions. The author would also like to thank Academy of Finland project "Stochastic and Harmonic Analysis, interactions, and applications" No. 133914, and the Väisälä foundation for financial support.

References

- [1] H. Bauer: Measure and Integration Theory. de Gruyter, 2001.
- [2] J-M. Bismut: Conjugate convex functions in optimal stochastic control. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, Vol.44(2), 384-404, 1973.
- [3] B. Bouchard, N. Touzi: Discrete Time Approximation and Monte-Carlo Simulation of Backward Stochastic Differential Equations. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* Vol. 111(2), 175-206, 2004.
- [4] B. Bouchard, R. Elie, N. Touzi: Discrete-time approximation of BSDEs and probabilistic schemes for fully nonlinear PDEs. *Radon Series Comp. Appl. Math.*, 8, 1-34, 2009.
- [5] P. Briand, B. Delyon, Y. Hu, E. Pardoux, L. Stoica: L_p solutions of backward stochastic differential equations. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 108:109-129, 2003.
- [6] P. Briand, R. Elie: A simple constructive approach to quadratic BSDEs with or without delay. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 2921-2939, 2013.
- [7] P. Briand, Y. Hu: BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 136(4), 604-618, 2006.

- [8] R. Buckdahn, J. Li: Stochastic Differential Games and Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs Equations. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol.47(1), 444-475, 2008.
- [9] P. Cheridito, K. Nam: BSDEs with terminal conditions that have bounded Malliavin derivative. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, Vol.266(3), 1257-1285, 2014.
- [10] Delbaen, Hu, Richou: On the uniqueness of solutions to quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, Vol.47(2), 559-574, 2011.
- [11] F. Delbaen, S. Tang: Harmonic analysis of stochastic equations and backward stochastic differential equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 146:291-336, 2010.
- [12] N. El Karoui, S. Peng, M.C. Quenez: Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Mathematical Finance* 7:1-71, 1997.
- [13] C. Geiss, S. Geiss, E. Gobet: Generalized fractional smoothness and L_p -variation of BSDEs with non-Lipschitz terminal condition. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 122:2078-2116, 2012.
- [14] S. Geiss: Weighted BMO and discrete time hedging within the Black-Scholes model. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 132, 13-38, 2005.
- [15] S. Geiss, J. Ylinen: Decoupling on the Wiener space and applications to BSDEs. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.5322v2>
- [16] E. Gobet, A. Makhlof: L_2 -time regularity of BSDEs with irregular terminal functions. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 120:1105-1132, 2010.
- [17] Y. Hu, P. Imkeller, M. Müller: Utility maximization in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, Vol.15(3), 1691-1712, 2005.
- [18] I. Karatzas, S. Shreve: Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus. 2nd Edition. Springer, 1991.
- [19] N. Kazamaki: Continuous Exponential Martingales and BMO. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1579*, Springer, 1994.
- [20] M. Kobylanski: Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth. *Annals of Probability*, 28(2), 558-602, 2000.

- [21] P.A. Meyer: Martingales locales fonctionnelles additives (II). Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg 12:786-803, 1978.
- [22] M-A. Morlais: Quadratic BSDEs driven by a continuous martingale and applications to the utility maximization problem. *Finance and Stochastics*, Vol.13(1), 121-150, 2009.
- [23] D. Nualart: The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics. 2nd edition, Springer, 2006.
- [24] E. Pardoux, S. Peng: Adapted Solution of a Backward Stochastic Differential Equation. *Systems Control Lett.*, 14, 55-61, 1990.
- [25] E. Pardoux, S. Peng: Backward Stochastic Differential Equations and Quasilinear Parabolic Partial Differential Equations. *Lecture Notes in CIS, vol.176*, Springer-Verlag, 200-217, 1992.
- [26] P.E. Protter: Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations. 2nd edition, Springer, 2004.
- [27] Y. Qiu: On the UMD-constants for a class of iterated $L_p(L_q)$ spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, Vol.263(8), 2409-2429, 2012.
- [28] D. Revuz and M. Yor: Continuous martingales and Brownian motion. Springer, 1999.
- [29] D.W. Stroock: Essentials of Integration Theory for Analysis. Springer 2011.
- [30] D. Williams: Probability with Martingales. Cambridge University Press 1991.
- [31] J. Zhang: Representation of solutions to BSDEs associated with a degenerate FSDE. *Ann. of Appl. Prob.* 15:1798-1831, 2005.